(v) It is essential that the permanent residence of the Dewan Peishkar should be near the taluks of Kunnatnad, Muvattupuzha and Todupuzha, where there are extensive areas of puduval lands, where registries of puduvals are largely being made, where bifurcation of pakuthies is required, and where agricultural companies are working.

(vi) Government owe to the backward taluks the same duty that they are discharging in improving the condition of the depressed classes.

(vii) The Western Outlet Road connects Alwaye with Munnar and Devicolam. The importance of Alwaye will be enhanced when the Cochin Harbour becomes an accomplished fact.

(viii) The location of the Division Peishkar's Office at Alwaye would enable the affairs of the Perumanam and Kudalmanickam Devaswoms being more efficiently managed.

(ix) It would be possible to check the inroads of vagrants, criminals, &c., and prevent the importation of epidemics.

(x) It would lead to greater amity between Cochin and Travancore.

(xi) Above all, it is eminently desirable that an officer of status should be stationed at the boundary to represent the State and maintain its dignity.

In the opinion of the Member, Kottayam would not suffer by the transfer. The host of public offices and institutions left in it would keep its position unimpaired. To remove any inconvenience caused by the transfer of the Division Cutcherry, the Division Assistant at Perumpavur might be posted to Kottayam. The Member was not particular that Alwaye should be the head-quarters, and he had no objection to Muvattupuzha, the geographical centre of the Northern Division, being selected. But Alwaye possessed the superior advantages enumerated above. Though Kottayam became the head-quarters of the Division about 40 years ago, it was significant that, as yet, steps had not been taken to secure a permanent abode for the Division Cutcherry. That would go to prove that, from the first, Government had no intention to stick to Kottayam permanently.

Dewan's reply.—The Member's representation will be considered.

(2) Forest.

19. Desirability of introducing certain changes in the Forest Regulation, especially in regard to the claims of the holders of registered lands to the royal trees standing on them.

Mr. Kanakku Thevan Raman (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) dwelt on the provision in the Forest Rules dated the 1st Meenam 1088, for the payment, by way of *kudivila*, of one-half of the value of royal trees on private lands, to the owners thereof. He said that the right to *kudivila* had been restricted by the judgment of the High Court in A. S. No. 16 of 1094, to royal trees on lands brought under registry prior to 1068 M. E., the year in which the Forest Regulation came into force. That judgment proceeded mainly on the Sirkar's contention in the case that the claim could not be recognised in regard to trees on lands registered subsequent to 1068. Great hardship had been caused by the judgment. In the first place, the judgment denied a right long recognised and established. Secondly, it was common knowledge that the existence of royal trees was a hindrance to the profitable cultivation of food grains and fruit trees. But the lands on which they grew were not on that account tax-free and the owners of such lands could not get any return for the *tharavila* and assessment paid by them, until the trees were felled and removed. The Member therefore prayed that orders be issued for the payment of *kudivila* under the Rules in all cases.

Dewan's reply.—All these points have been already raised by other Members and have been replied to.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly